
The Old Persian Text of the Bisitun Inscription

Author(s): George G. Cameron

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Journal of Cuneiform Studies*, Vol. 5, No. 2 (1951), pp. 47-54

Published by: [The American Schools of Oriental Research](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1359449>

Accessed: 13/12/2012 07:57

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The American Schools of Oriental Research is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Cuneiform Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

THE OLD PERSIAN TEXT OF THE BISITUN INSCRIPTION

GEORGE G. CAMERON

University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Mich., U. S. A.

Under the auspices of the American Schools of Oriental Research¹ and the University of Michigan, in November of 1948 the writer sought to bring to an end a century of work upon the relief and inscriptions of Darius, King of Persia, on Mount Bisitun in Iran. The inscriptions were first reached and copied by Lieutenant (afterward Major General Sir) Henry C. Rawlinson between 1836 and 1847. To his indefatigable energy and remarkable ability the science of cuneiform studies will always continue to owe a great debt. Despite his monumental achievement, however, Rawlinson made this first copy in the early stages of decipherment when only too often he had no way of knowing what to look for. Further, the elements had exacted a heavy toll since the inscriptions were carved by the workmen of Darius; quite naturally Rawlinson's copy was defective.

In an effort to clarify some of the more dubious readings of the Old Persian text, A. V. Williams Jackson of Columbia University mounted to a ledge below the inscriptions in 1903. In the following year, 1904, working on behalf of the British Museum, L. W. King and R. Campbell Thompson improved enormously on the previous readings. By a fortunate discovery they were enabled to use a rock shelf high up the mountainside above the monument; dropping a rope from this shelf and sitting in a kind of boatswain's chair they copied the inscriptions by swinging back and forth across the face of the vertical rock. Carefully they reworked the four and a half columns of the Old Persian version, the three columns of the Elamite text below and to the left of the relief, as well as the Babylonian text which runs across two faces of an overhanging rock immediately above the Elamite version. Their success is indicated by the fact that theirs is today the standard publication.

Yet they, too, made mistakes. They were unable to read the signs in many passages and made a number of surely erroneous or impossible restorations. The fault was by no means wholly theirs,

¹ The writer was Annual Professor of the Baghdad School for the year 1948-1949.

for any three men reading a worn and eroded inscription may interpret it in three, if not more, differing ways.

Succeeding generations of scholars have advanced suggestions and emendations which needed to be checked by improved archeological techniques, against the original inscription. Other problems likewise called for solution. Neither Rawlinson nor King and Thompson had been able to copy four columns of inscriptions which lie to the right of the relief, although the latter authors had indeed determined that at least a part of the first column was written in Elamite. Further, it could be expected that a closer examination of the relief would reveal new details of Persian art. Finally, it could be hoped that a re-examination of the surrounding rock might determine the method by which the workmen of Darius had succeeded in carving the relief and the lengthy texts high up the mountainside, on a spot which is today all but inaccessible.

Fortunately, though in some respects fortuitously, the expedition in 1948 was able to solve many, even if not all, of the questions which remained unanswered by Rawlinson, Jackson, and King and Thompson.²

² See the *National Geographic Magazine*, December 1950, pp. 825-844.

It is a pleasure to acknowledge the material assistance of the people and the government of Iran in the furtherance of the undertaking. The Minister of Education, the Director of Antiquities, and the staff of the Tehran Museum granted full permission and gave considerable help; the Governor General of the Western Provinces gave moral and physical encouragement; and workmen from the village of Bisitun willingly and capably provided their labor.

American and British corporations likewise gave materials and time. Latex rubber for squeezes, steel cable, and scaffolding were gifts of the American Anode, Inc., the American Wire and Steel Company, and the Universal Patent Scaffolding Company, respectively. Without the aid of workmen from the Kirmanshah Petroleum Company, of its Director A. W. M. Robertson, and of other executive officers, our achievement would have been impossible. To all these, as to many more, the writer of this article begs leave to extend his grateful thanks on behalf of the Baghdad School of the American Schools of Oriental Research.

We secured a complete copy of the four columns lying to the right of the relief and ascertained that this inscription is written altogether in Elamite cuneiform; it is, in fact, an exact duplicate (and was undoubtedly a prior copy) of the hitherto known Elamite text which appears below and to the left of the relief. Thus, while the hope that this previously unread inscription would be totally new and different proved unfounded, there was still certain gain. By determining what was here written we were able to unlock a door that, until opened, would always be tantalizing. More significantly, the copy made of it enables us to restore many passages in the other version which had already been copied—to which, it may be noted, all too little attention and care has been paid by previous copyists and translators.

Ultimately all new readings, including also those of the Elamite and the Babylonian texts, will be published. The present article deals almost exclusively with the more important or significant new readings obtained in the four and a half columns of the Old Persian version. Many of them were offered to and adopted by Roland G. Kent for the publication of his excellent volume, *Old Persian: Grammar, Texts, Lexicon*, which appeared in May of 1950, or only fifteen months after my return to America. Much of Professor Kent's manuscript had already been completed before I began to plan a re-examination of Bisitun. The needs of science and scholarly effort made it imperative that Kent's book incorporate all those assured readings which could be made available to him in the short time intervening between my return and the appearance of his manuscript in page proof. It was impossible, in the midst of other pressing work, for me to complete my reading of all squeezes in that interim. The following pages will therefore include not only those new readings which were gladly offered to Kent, but also others which have since been determined.

At first sight, the Old Persian text of the monument appeared to be infinitely more unreadable than it had been over one hundred years ago when Rawlinson copied it, and still more damaged than when King and Thompson worked upon it a generation ago. A horizontal fissure above these columns, but beneath the relief, is obviously responsible for part of the damage. This fissure is actually the exit of an underground river; after a rain lasting less than seven hours, for example,

water issued from the fissure and through more than six openings flowed down across the face of the inscription for over fifty hours. The rock itself is limestone, and centuries of tumbling water have eaten it away at the top of the columns, in several places, to a depth of five or six inches. In those places, obviously, all the writing has disappeared.

Fortunately, however, we discovered that not all the engraved wedges beneath the path of the water had in reality been eroded away. Instead, the limestone rock dissolved in the water has frequently been deposited lower down upon the face of the inscription. Signs long thought to be eroded, destroyed, or completely washed away, are now actually covered with a solid deposit of rock. This is not destruction at all, but preservation; geologically speaking, it is a tufaceous formation over the surface of the original inscription.³ By delicate hammering through the surface deposit we could reach the original rock surface. When a small amount of water (which was then applied to the surface of the still invisible wedges) began to evaporate, there was clearly discernible a difference in coloration between original rock and filled-in wedges. Color photography was sometimes employed and was often effective in such instances, but squeezes, of course, were of no value, since the surface was absolutely smooth. Nevertheless wedge after wedge and sign after sign thus became evident to the eye, and many of the new readings which we obtained were secured by such means. Otherwise latex rubber squeezes (especially for Column IV, lines 88–92, and for all of Column V) proved invaluable.

The following readings are based on all three methods. In their presentation here, it is to be noted that

(1) The sign + indicates space for one lost character; for a longer gap, +. . . + with a following note stating for how many characters the space is adequate. In specifying the length, the word-divider is counted as one unit like any syllabic character.

³ Previous investigators had thought that the rock-cut inscriptions were coated by Darius' workmen with a "varnish" or "brown shellac" in order to preserve the surface finish of the texts; see Rawlinson, *JRAS* 10.193 (1847), and Jackson, *Persia Past and Present* (1906), 194. Of such "shellac" there is no trace, however; it is, instead, the tufa itself which gives a "varnished" appearance.

(2) The sign ○ indicates that there is vacant space for one character, on which nothing was originally inscribed, usually because the surface was too rough or was eroded too deeply to receive a legible character. When ○ falls within an illegible gap, it is usually impossible to state where it stood with reference to the restored characters.

(3) The doubled ○ ○ is used to indicate the blank space for two characters which was regularly left in DB before the beginning of a new section of the text with *θātiy* : *Dārayavauš*.

COLUMN I. The major damage to this column begins eighteen inches from the right edge. After every rain, water gushes from the rock fault between the top of the column and the relief above it. At two places the rock has been dissolved by the watery stream to a depth of more than three inches.

1.7: Read *a-ma-a-ta-a* both here and in DBa 11.⁴

1.21: The proper reading is *a-ga-ra-i-ya*, normalized by Kent as *agriya*, meaning 'first, foremost', and the like. This replaces Rl.'s *a-ga-ta-a* (despite his statement, "The only letter to which doubt attaches is the final *a*", JRAS, 1847, p. xlii) and KT's *a-ga-ra-+-+*. All signs were assured, after removal of the tufa.

1.23: Rl. and KT were correct in reading *apariyāya*, as against the frequently suggested emendation to *upariyāya*.

COLUMN II. The upper part of this column has suffered heavy damage, as may be seen in the photographs. Beginning about 39 inches from the left edge, and continuing for more than 20 inches, the rock has been eaten away by water to a depth of six inches or more. It is apparently in infinitely worse condition than when KT examined it less than fifty years ago.

2.2: Neither Hüsing's (and Weissbach's) *a[muθa]* nor KT's *a[bīy]* can today be substanti-

⁴ For all abbreviations, see Kent, *Old Persian*, pp. 2-5. Those which are most commonly used are: KT = L. W. King and R. C. Thompson, *The Sculptures and Inscriptions of Darius the Great on the Rock of Behistun in Persia* (London, 1907); Rl. = H. C. Rawlinson. In a few passages, even in direct quotations from the works of other scholars, difficult type-forms have been avoided by the use of simpler but unmistakable equivalents.

ated, and not even the initial letter, formerly visible, is discernible.

2.24: Read *harw* : *adakaiy* : *naiy* : *avadā* : *āha* : The phrase (after removal of tufa) was clearly visible. The prosaic statement, "he was not there at that time", is somewhat amusing in view of the conjectures that have been made.

2.33: Read : *za-u-za-ha-ya* : The somewhat unexpected form complements the Babylonian *šu-ū-šu* and the Elamite *su-iš-ša*.

2.44: Read : *u-ya-ma-a* : The first attempt to read these signs yielded nothing except the following comment: "No sign traces whatsoever; all obscured by erosion—or is it incrustation?" After removal of the tufa, each letter in the above reading was clearly visible.

2.53: Read : *i-za-la-a* : All characters are preserved, and the long controversy over the reading may be forgotten. We are now free to accept the identification with Syriac *Izelā* (the Tur Abdin complex of hills in Assyria) proposed by Markwart in *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte von Eran*, 2.167; the Elamite form is *iš-ši-la*.

2.74: Read : *utā* : *gaušā* : *utā* : *h^azānam* : The last word, 'tongue', is written *ha-za-a-na-ma*. Rl. noted that nine letters "were wholly lost"... "between the *u* of *utā* and the final *ma* on the right of the fissure" (JRAS, 1847, p. li); KT asserted the reading to be *harbānam*, which was accepted by Tolman but rejected by Weissbach for his own suggestion *uzbānam*. Meillet (MSLP 19.58-9) recommended *h(i)zbānam* on the basis of Avestan *hizvā-*, with which the stem is obviously identical.

2.75: Read [*I ca-ša*]-*ma* : See on 2.89.

2.89: Read : *I ca-ša-ma* : This reading, normalized by Kent as *cašam*, replaces the *ucašma* of previous copyists and editors. Jackson, after examining the passage in 1903, wrote (JAOS, 24.88): "The obliterated word... yielded no new results and is equally illegible in both 2.75 and 2.79" (sic). He was also of the opinion that the second character from the end resembled *ha* more closely than *ša*, "but the likeness between the two letters in the cuneiform character leads easily to misapprehension." Following KT's reading *ucašma* in line 89, however, Jackson (apud Tolman, *Lexicon*, p. 75) suggested that the proper reading might be merely : *cašma*, i.e. the word-divider followed by the word itself. But the text of line 89 reads clearly, after *utāšaiy* and the word-

divider, *I* (i.e. a single vertical wedge) *ca-ša-ma*. The vertical, as I noted at the Rock, "could never have been a part of *u*; it is too tall." Evilly, in line 75, nothing can today be seen beyond *utāšaiy*, not even the word divider. However, the spacing here is identical with that in line 89; from the beginning of the final character of *utāšaiy* in 89 to the division stroke following *cašma*, it is just 23 cm.; likewise, for the same space in line 75, it is 23 cm. We may safely conclude, therefore, that the readings in the two lines are identical and that Darius was thus clearly stating that he put out a "single" eye in each case.

2.90: Examination of the latex squeeze confirms the reading (so far as it is legible) of : *avai[na :]*.

COLUMN III.

3.26: Read : *kāra : pārsa : hya : vⁱθāpatiy : hacā : yadāyā : frataram : ha-* Rl. had read the last two complete words as *yadāyā : fratarta*, and this reading was confirmed by KT. Doubt had often been expressed concerning *yadāyā*, but, as Weissbach noted (KIA p. 46n.), "Nachdem dieses Wort von K. und T. am Original festgestellt worden ist, erledigen sich alle weiteren Konjekturen." This word has indeed been correctly read, but the following word is *frataram*, not *fratarta*; my reading of the latter, incidentally, is supported by Rl., who notes (JRAS, 1847, p. 232) that in one of his copies the last character is *ma*. As an adjective meaning 'prior', *fratara* occurs elsewhere only in DNb 38; as an adverb, however, *frataram* appears in XPg 11 and probably in A¹Pa 21.

The hitherto uncertain Elamite rendering of this passage likewise provides complete substantiation of this reading. Column III, line 3, of the Elamite version reads

m^ataš-š^u-t^p m^bar-šⁱp ap-pa — ú-EL-man-nu
— *an-za-an.mar ir-pi kup-pa-ka₄*

the translation of which appears to be, "The Persian army which in the palace had come(?) from Anzan previously." Thus *ir-pi* 'former, early, (the) first' corresponds with OP *frataram*. The certain reading of the place-name Anzan, followed by *mar* 'from', would appear to identify the OP *yadāyā* with this name, though this is not entirely satisfactory. It is interesting to note that the same place-name apparently occurs in the corresponding portion of the Babylonian text,

line 72, where at the turn or corner of the rock appear the signs *an-za-+...+* preceding *it-te-ik-ru-* 'they rebelled'.

3.66: It is worthy of note that for the OP place-name *ga-du-u-ta-va*, denominated as a 'land' (*dahyāuš*), the Elamite reads unquestionably — *ir-du-ma-ka₄ hi-še — har-ra-u-[ma-ti-iš]* 'Irdumaka, by name, in Arachosia'. KT (p. 136n.) thought that the *ir* in this word was probably an error for *kán* by the engraver's accidental omission of one vertical wedge (an interpretation accepted by Weissbach, KIA 53n.); but the name *Irdumaka* is more probably another name altogether for the same place (it is difficult or impossible to equate the last two syllables, Elam. *-ma-ka*, with OP *-ta-va*).

3.88-92: Even in Rl.'s day these lines had suffered great damage, and KT by their gaps show the difficulties which they, too, experienced in reading. A sign-for-sign transliteration, made both at the Rock and from latex squeezes, gives the following:

88 : *ra-*
89 *u-ca-ba-i-ša : θa-ka-ta-a : a-ha : a-va-θa-a :*
a-va-ma : a-ra-xa-ma : [ha-ya : na-ba]-u-ku-○-
u-[da-ra-ca-ra : +...¹...+]-ma : a-
90 *ga-u-ba-ta-[a] : u-ta-a : ma-ra-ta-i-[ya]-a : ta-*
ya-i-ša-i-ya : fa-[ra-ta-ma-a] : a-○-nu-u-ša-[i-
ya-a : a-ha-ta-a : +...²]
91 [*+...³ : na-i-ya-ša]-ta-a-ya-ma : ha-[u-va] : a-*
[ra]-xa : [u]-ta-[a : ma-ra-ta]-i-ya-a : ta-ya-i-ša-
[i]-ya : [fa]-ra-[ta-ma-a : a-nu]-
92 *u-ša-i-ya-a : a-ha-ta-a : ba-a-ba-i-ra-[u]-va :*
[u]-za⁴-ya-○-a-pa-ta-i-ya : a-ka-ra-i-ya-ta-a⁵

Notes: 89¹ This gap contains space for at least 5 signs after the divider. 90² In this gap, additional space for not over 4 signs, perhaps for only 3. 91³ Not over 2 signs before the divider. 92⁴ There is no space for *ma* between *za* and *ya*. 92⁵ Here follows uninscribed space sufficient for about 5 characters.

COLUMN IV.

4.6: The correct reading is *a-da-ma-ša-○-i-ša :* Rl. copied *adamšām*, but KT noted that the next to the last sign was *i*, not *a*. KT read the final sign as *ma*, remarking that there were "possibly traces of an erasure" after it; my notes at the Rock read "space followed by certain *ša*."

4.12: Read *ma-na-a : [I na]-di-i-ta-ba-i-ra.*

Rl. remarks (JRAS, 1847, p. lvii), "The word *manā* is given in my rough copy, with a remark

that the letters are hardly distinguishable. The employment of such a term is certainly superfluous and at variance with the construction of the other clauses of the paragraph; and I almost think therefore that the interval was never lettered, and that I mistook for characters the natural indentations of the broken surface." KT, however, saw [ma]-na-a [: I na]-di-i-... , which Weissbach accepted, although he suggested (KIA 59n), "Vielleicht ist das *ā* vom Steinmetzen versehentlich eingehauen und dann unvollkommen getilgt, sodass zu umschreiben wäre: *akunauš* : [I] *nad*^o." This is impossible; *manā* is fully visible, even today.

4.43: Read : *θa-u-va-a-ma* : *ma-a-ta-ya* : *da-ra-[u-ga]-ma* : *ma-na-i-ya-a-ha-ya* ○ ○ : *θa-a-ta-i-ya* :

4.44: This passage caused me no little mental and physical agony—both at the Rock and subsequently. KT read only the beginning of the name of the deity, *a-u-ra-ma-za-da-[a...]*, followed by a gap of "four or five characters" before *-ra-ta-i-ya-i-ya*. Upon removal of the sedimentary deposits overlying this passage I read "clearly" and repeatedly : *a-u-ra-ma-za-da-a-ha-du-ga-ma* : *va^l-ra-ta-i-ya-i-ya* : There is no division stroke between *a* and *ha*, or between *ha* and *du*; Kent, however, has suggested that what I saw as *du* must be reinterpreted as division stroke followed by *ra*. At the Rock, nonetheless, I noted explicitly, "No space for division stroke after *a* but before *ha*. Nor was a division stroke written after *ha*. The angle wedge forming the beginning of *du* is too large to be considered the division stroke. But only two horizontals can be seen in *du*." My copy of the crucial passage, made at the Rock, is here reproduced:



4.46: Read *va-ša-na-a* : *a-u-ra-[ma-za-da-a-ha]* : *u-ta-a-ma-i-ya* : Weissbach's reading, based upon KT, was *vašnā* : *aura[mazdāha : ap]imaiy*.

When the sedimentary deposits of ages had been removed, the signs appeared as represented above, confirming the conjecture of Bartholomae, AiW 83 (1904) and of Gray, AJP 30.457 (1909).

4.49: This line, which plagued both KT and Jackson, is still very troublesome. KT saw : *θa-a-[...]* with space for about 8 signs before : *ma-na-a*.

Jackson, JAOS 24.89 (1903), says that he could perceive *θa-da*, "but with the latter part ...

could do nothing." Visible to me was *θa-da-ya-a-[...]* with space for about 6 signs before : *ma-na-a*.

4.51: Read *pa-ru-u-va-a* : *xa-ša-a-ya-θa-i-ya* [a :] *ya-a-ta-a* : *a-ha* : *a-va-i-ša-a-ma* : *a-va-a* : *na-i-ya*.

4.54: Both my readings at the Rock and a splendid latex squeeze of the line confirm the following reading:

: *a-va-θa-a* : *ka-a-ra-ha-ya-a* : *ra-a-di-i-ya*
: *ma-a* : *a-pa-ga-u-da-ya* :

The reading of the second word here noted, 'to the people', was assured because each rock-cut wedge had been filled up with limestone sedimentation. The wedges of the following word *rādiy*, on the contrary, had been partially eaten away by the downpouring waters. The latex squeeze, however, in presenting every infinitesimal indentation, makes the above reading positive.

At the moment of recovery of this reading, it appeared likely that the newly discovered *rādiy* was identical with the postposition which occurs in DNb 9 and 10–11, and also in *avahyarādiy*. The Elamite version, however, suggests a different interpretation. The corresponding section of the Elamite rendering, Col. III line 74, had not been fully or correctly read by KT, whom Weissbach followed; it was restored by them as follows:

ap-pa ¹ú *hu-ud-da* *hi* *ši-la* *hu*-[*be-in-tuk-ki-me*
a-nu *ku*]*t-tan-ti*

When the tufa covering this line had been removed the reading was shown to be

ap-pa ¹ú *hu-ud-da* *hi* *ši-la* ¹*taš-šu-ib-be*
¹*ap tu₄-ru-iš* *a-nu* ¹*ku*^l-*tan-ti*

which would yield as translation, "(Now do you believe) what I did—even) this (*or* thus) to the people tell; do not conceal (it)." The Elamite verb *tu₄-ru-iš* (perhaps an imperative of a root *turu-* or *tiri-* 'say, speak'; cf. Cameron, Persepolis Treasury Tablets, p. 48) is thus made to render the OP *rādiy*.

4.55: Read *ha-du-u-ga-a-ma* : *na-i-ya* : *a-pa-ga-[u-da-ya-a]-ha-ya*.

4.64: Read : *a-ha-ma* : *na-i-ya* : *a-da-ma* : *na-i-ma-i-ya* :

4.65: Read *-a-[ya]-ma* [:] *na-i-ya* : *ša-ka-u-ra-*

activities here enumerated took place—that is, much of their artistic and annalistic efforts was concluded by 519. When at the conclusion of his third year the ruler gave order that these subsequent accomplishments also should be pictured and related, the workmen had no recourse but to cut away part of the Elamite text just mentioned, in order to put in its place the figure of the captured Scythian, and to add (at the right of the four completed columns of OP text) this last half column. The significance of the newly discovered data for history is of course apparent.

At the top of the column, the rock and consequently all signs are completely gone near the beginning, the rock being eaten away to the depth of five inches. How many signs were engraved on the original surface can hardly be said, especially as the surface, even in Darius' own time, must have been partially destroyed and therefore in part unavailable for engraving. In lines 1 and 2, the phrasing requires but 4 characters to be restored, yet the space would permit 6 or 7. On the left side, a vertical line from the top of the gap would pass *ta* in 1, slightly cut *ta* in 2, and just clear *ça* in 3; on the right, a similar vertical line would pass *a* in 1, slightly cut *ma* in 2, and entirely clear *θa* in 3.

The transliterated text of Column V now follows:

- 1 *θa-a-ta-[i-ya : da]-a-ra-ya-va-u-ša [:] xa-ša-a-ya-θa-i-ya :*
- 2 *i-ma : ta-[ya : a-da]-ma : a-ku-○-u-○-[na-va-ma :] du-u-vi-○-i-ta-i-ya-○¹-a-*
- 3 *ma-ca¹ : ça-[i-ta-a-ma-ca-a² :] θa-ra-da-ma : pa-sa-[a]-va [:] ya-θa-a [:] xa-○-ša-a-ya-*
- 4 *θa-i-ya : [a-ba-va-ma : u]-va-ja : na-a-○-ma-[a¹] : da-ha-ya-a-u-ša : ha-[u]-*
- 5 *va : ha-[mi-i-ça-i-ya]-a : a-○-ba-va : [I ma-ra-ta-i-ya] : [a]-ta-ma-○-i-ta : na-a-ma : [u]-*
- 6 *va-ji-i-[ya : a-va-ma : ma]-θa-i-ša-ta-ma [:] a-ku-u-na-va-○-○-ta-a : pa-○-sa-a-va : a-[da]-*
- 7 *ma : ka-a-[ra-ma : fa-ra-a-i-ša]-ya-ma :¹ [I ma-ra-ta-i]-¹ya² : ga-u-ba-ru-u-va :*
- 8 *na-a-ma [:] pa-a-ra-sa : ma]-na-a : ba-da-ka [:] a-va-ma-ša-a-ma] : ma-θa-i-ša-ta-ma : a-ku-u-*
- 9 *na-va-ma : [pa-sa-a-va :¹ g]a-u-ba-ru-u-va : [ha-da-a] : ka-a-[ra]-a : a-ša-i-ya-○-va :*
- 10 *u-va-ja-ma [:] ha-ma-ra-na-ma] : a-ku-u-na-○-u-ša : ha-[da-○]-a : u-va-ji-i-ya-i-ba-i-ša : pa-sa-*

- 11 *a-va : [ga-u-ba-ru-u]-va : u-va-ji-i-ya-a : [a-va]-a-ja : u-ta-a : vi-i-ya-ma-ra-da¹ :*
- 12 *u-ta-a : [ta-ya-ma-ša-a]-ma : ma-θa-[i-ša-ta-○¹-ma :] a-ga-ra-ba-a-ya : a-na-ya : a-ba-○-i-*

Notes to preceding text: ²¹ Here a fissure which can hardly be any character, even the word-divider. ³¹ Final *-ca* seemingly a defective writing for *-ca-a* = *-cā* 'and', in view of the word which follows. ³² Possibly a defective writing *-ca* here as earlier in the line (see preceding note), but the full writing *-ca-a* crowds the characters slightly if at all. ⁴¹ Possibly a blank space here; but the language requires the *-a*. ⁷¹ There is no space for Rl.'s *U[wajham]* = *Ūvjam*, nor any trace of the initial *u-*, despite KT as well as WBn. ⁷² The *-ya* is required by the obvious restoration, but the traces of it are dubious. ⁹¹ There is no space for Rl.'s *haw* in the gap; Weissbach in WBn and KIA was right in excluding it. ¹¹¹ There is no divider between *ya* and *ma*; apart from accepting the divider, Weissbach, ZfA 46.55, was right in his interpretation. ¹²¹ There are traces of 6 characters in this gap, but the wording permits only 5; one may have been partly erased by the engraver.

- 13 *ya : ma-a-ma [:] u-ta-a-ša-i]-ma : a-[da-ma] : [a-va-a]-○-ja-na-ma : [pa]-sa-a-va : da-ha-ya-a-*
- 14 *u-ša : ma-na-[a : a-ba-va] ○ ○ : θa-a-ta-[i-ya : da-a]-ra-ya-va-u-ša : xa-ša-a-ya-θa-i-*
- 15 *ya : a-va-i-ya : [u]-va-[ji]-○-i-ya-a [:] a-ra-i-ka-a : a-ha :] u-ta-a-ša-a-[ma] : a-u-ra-ma-*
- 16 *za-da-a : [na¹]-[i]-ya : [a-ya]-di-[i]-ya : a-u-[ra-ma-za-da-a]-ma : a-ya-da-i-ya : va-ša-na-a : a-*
- 17 *u-ra-ma-za-[da-a-ha : ya-θa-a] : ma-a-ma [:] ka-a-ma : a-va]-θa-a-di-i-ša : a-ku-u-na-va-ma*
- 18 *○ ○ : θa-a-ta-[i-ya : da-a-ra]-ya-va-u-ša : xa-ša-a-ya]-θa-i-ya : ha-ya : a-u-ra-ma-za-da-a-*
- 19 *ma : ya-da-[a]-○-[ta-i]-ya : ya-a-[+ .¹ . +] : a-ha-ta-i-ya : u-ta-a : ji-i-va-[ha]-*
- 20 *ya-a [:] u-[ta-a : +¹]-ra-ta-○-ha-ya-[a]² ○ ○ [:] θa-a-ta-i]-ya : da-○-a-ra-ya-va-u-ša : xa-[ša]-*
- 21 *a-ya-θa-i-ya : pa-[sa-a-va : ha-da]-a : ka-[a-ra-a : a]-da-ma : [a-ša]-i-ya-va-ma : a-ba-i-ya : sa-ka-○-*
- 22 *a-ma : pa-sa-[a]-v[a : + .¹ . +] : ta-i-ga-ra-a-ma : ba-ra-ta-i-²*
- 23 *ya : i¹-[+ .² . +]-i-ša-[+ - +³]-i-ya : a-ba-i-ya : ○ da-ra-ya : a-*
- 24 *va-a-[+ .¹ . +]-ra-xa-[+²]-a-[+ .³ . +]-a : vi⁴-i-sa-a : vi-○-i-ya-ta-ra-○-*

Notes to preceding text: ¹⁹¹ The restoration *yā[tā : taumā]* suits the space, but becomes grammatically impossible, in view of note 2, line 20, since the sentence will then have no principal clause; nor do the readings and spacing suit the *[ši]yāt[iš : avahyā]* of Eilers, JNES 7.106-10. ²⁰¹ One sign only; apparently *ma*, though it

might be *a*. 20² No space here for an inserted word, such as Hinz's *bavatiy*, Kent's *šiyātiš*, Eilers' *artam*. 22¹ After the divider, no legible signs for about 14 spaces. 22² This *i* is legible, though never before read. 23¹ This sign may be *i*, but is definitely not *pa*. 23² In this gap, traces of about 15 signs, but none legible. 23³ In this gap, traces of 3 signs. 24¹ In this gap, space for about 6 signs, but no traces remain. 24² Space for 1 sign only. 24³ In this gap, bare traces of about 11 signs, none legible. 24⁴ The sign *vi* is certain, eliminating KT's *pa*.

- 25 *ya-ma* [+ . . . +] *a-ja-na-ma* : *a-[na]-i-ya-ma* : *a-ga-*
 26 *ra-ba-a-ya-[ma : ha-u-va : ba-○¹]-sa-ta* [: *a-na-ya-ta-a² : a*]-○-*ba-i-ya* : *ma-○-a-ma* : *u-ta-○-*
 27 *a*[- + . . . +] *i-ša-t*[*a-ša-a-ma* : *sa-ku-u*]-*xa* : *na-a-○-ma* : *a-va-ma* : *a-ga-*
 28 *ra-ba-a*[- + . . . +] *a-na-ya* [: *a-ba-i-ya* : *ma-a-ma* : *a*]-*va-da-a* : *a-na-○-i-○-ya-ma* : *ma-θa-*
 29 *i-ša-○-t*[*a-ma*] : *a-ku-u-na-va-ma* : [*ya-θa-a* :] *ma-a-ma* : [*ka*]-*a-ma* : *a-ha* : *pa-○-sa-a-va* : *da-*
 30 *ha-ya-a*[-*u-ša* : *ma*]-*na-a* : [*a*]-*ba-○¹-va* ○ ○ [: *θa-a-ta-i*]-*ya* : *da-a-ra-ya-va-○-u-ša* : *xa-ša-a-ya-*
 31 *θa-i*[*ya* : + . . . +] : *a-ra-i*[-*ka-a* : *a*]-*ha* [:] *u-ta-a* : *na-i-ya* : *a-u-○-ra-ma-za-da-*
 32 *a*[-*ša-a-ma¹* : *a-ya*]-*di-i-ya* : *a-u-ra-ma*[-*za*]-*da*[-*a-ma* :] *a-ya-da-i-ya* : *va-ša-na-a* : *a-u-ra-ma-*
 33 *za-da-a*[-*ha* : *ya-θa-a* : *ma-a-ma*] : *ka-a-ma* : [*a-va-θa-a-di-i*]-*ša* : *a-ku-u-na-va-ma* ○ ○ : *θa-a-ta-*
 34 *i-ya* [: *da-a*]-*ra-ya-va*[-*u-ša* : *xa*]-*ša-a-ya-θa-i-ya* [: *ha-ya*] : *a-u-ra-ma-za-da-a-ma* : *ya-da-a-ta-*

- 35 *i-ya* : [+ . . . +]-*ma* [: *a-ha-ta-i-ya* :] *u-ta-a* : *ji-i-va-ha-ya-a* : *u-ta-a*
 36 : [+ . . . +]

Notes to preceding text: 25¹ Space for about 18 signs, but no traces; not even of *sa-ka-*, recorded by KT. 26¹ One space in this gap must be blank. 26² The spacing fits this word. 27¹ No traces in this gap; space for not over 13 signs. 28¹ Space for 7 or 8 signs before the divider. 30¹ An ancient erasure here. 31¹ Space for about 10 signs after the divider. 32¹ This restoration is needed for the spacing. 35¹ For this passage, see note 1 on Line 19 and note 2 on Line 20; the gap here is ample for at least 11 signs. 36¹ No legible signs after the divider; there were not over 11 signs inscribed in this line, and perhaps not so many.

As indicated above, all other new readings of the Bisitun inscription obtained during November of 1948—in OP, Babylonian, and Elamite cuneiform—will be published subsequently. At the moment, the writer is hard pressed with other work, not only in the building of a program in Near Eastern Studies at the University of Michigan, but also in organizing a University-sponsored expedition to Iraq and Iran in 1951. Further delay in the publication of the major revisions of the OP text, however, cannot be permitted, and the above corrections are offered in the spirit of Darius himself, who said, "If this record thou shalt not conceal, (but) tell it to the people, may Ahuramazda be a friend to thee, may there be to thee a family abundantly, and mayest thou live long."